

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 11, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-5, 8-13, 15 and 16 are rejected to by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13 and 15 have been amended and claims 2, 3, 10, 11 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 12, 13, 15 and 16 remain pending in this application.

As a preliminary matter, the Examiner indicates on page 2 of the Office Action that the information disclosure statement (IDS) filed on July 11, 2007 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) and will not be considered. Applicant notes the content of the July 11, 2007 IDS was resubmitted for consideration on August 16, 2007. The initialed Form 1449 was returned from the Examiner with the December 11, 2007 non-final office action. Thus, the issue of the July 11, 2007 IDS is rendered moot.

Claims 1-2, 4, 8-10, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono et al. (US 2001/0043291, hereinafter “Kono”) in view of Nakanishi et al. (US 6,781,642, hereinafter “Nakanishi”). Claims 3, 5-7, 11, 13, and 15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono in view of Nakanishi as applied to claims 1-2, 4-8-10, 12 and 16 above, and further in view of Murakami et al. (US 6,570,707, hereinafter “Murakami”).

Applicant submits that Kono and Nakanishi, singly or in combination, do not teach or suggest every element of the claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a touch panel for a display device having a combination of features of “the flexible printed cable...has a first part extended from the edge of the display device to connect the signal applying lines to the plurality of metal electrodes, a second part extended from the first part and overlapping the driver IC, and a plurality of through-holes between the first part and the second part, the first and second parts being perpendicular to each other,” and “wherein the drive IC is arranged on the rear side of the display device and a portion of first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on a lower surface of the first part of the flexible printed cable connects to a portion of the first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on an upper surface of the second part of the flexible printed

cable through the plurality of through holes, so that the signal applying lines aren't directly in contact with the driver IC."

None of cited references discloses or suggests at least the feature of "wherein the drive IC is arranged on the rear side of the display device and a portion of first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on a lower surface of the first part of the flexible printed cable connects to a portion of the first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on an upper surface of the second part of the flexible printed cable through the plurality of through holes, so that the signal applying lines aren't directly in contact with the driver IC."

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner states that Kono discloses the second part of flexible printed cable 11. However, Applicant submits Kono, expressly or inherently, does not disclose the second part being perpendicular to the first part of FPC. Further, as the Examiner stated on page 4 of Office Action, Kono does not disclose "wherein the flexible printed cable extended to a rear side of the display device for applying signal voltages to the metal electrodes, wherein the flexible printed cable is bent over an edge of the upper and lower substrates from a top to a bottom of the display device, and has the second part overlapping the driver IC". Also, the Examiner said that Nakanishi discloses the control circuit 44 (corresponding to 'driver IC' of the claimed invention) and wiring boards 47 (corresponding to 'flexible printed cable' of the claimed invention). In Nakanishi, the control circuit 44 is in contact with the wiring boards 47, so that it will remain ESD (Electro Static Discharge) between the control circuit 44 and the wiring boards. In contrast, the claimed invention recites the feature of "a portion of first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on a lower surface of the first part of the flexible printed cable connects to a portion of the first signal applying lines of the plurality of signal applying lines on an upper surface of the second part of the flexible printed cable through the plurality of through holes, so that the signal applying lines aren't directly in contact with the driver IC" and has the effect to prevent ESD between the driver IC and the flexible printed cable.

Applicant submits Murakami does not cure the above deficiency, because there is no disclosure or suggestion to show the position of through holes and the relation between the driver IC and through holes.

Further, on page 5, lines 8~12 of the Office Action, the Examiner said that FPC 11 has plurality of through holes (broken lines on element 11). However, the broken lines means that

signal applying lines are beneath the FPC, this allegation is not the same with the disclosure of Kono.

Based upon the above discussion, Applicant submits claim 1 is allowable over Kono, Nikanishi and Murakami. Further, claim 9 is allowable over Kono, Nikanishi and Murakami for at least the reasons given for claim 1.

Applicant notes that claims 4, 5, 7, 8 each depends from independent base claim 1 and that each includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 1, while claims 12, 13, 15, and 16 each depends from independent base claim 9 and each includes by reference all of the limitations of claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 4-5, 7, 8 and 12-13, 15-16 are each allowable over the cited references at least based on their dependencies and for the reasons given for the respective base claims 1 and 9.

Applicant believes the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 6, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant